SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

15th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XV, Number 20 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | December 1, 1985

Q&A with an Academic Lobbyist

Working on Capitol Hill for Science and Profit

With anti-deficit politics foreshadowing more than the usual money troubles for the scientific community, SGR felt it's time for another talk with an outstanding lobbyist for research-related appropriations, Gerald S. J. Cassidy, President of Cassidy and Associates, whom we last interviewed in November 1983 (SGR Vol. XIII, No. 19). His firm is renowned for working Capitol Hill to finance laboratory and other university buildings for its clients, generally to the exasperation of federal agency officials, who regard such lobbying as interference with their influence over disbursement of the goodies. (See Page 2 for a profile of the firm.) Cassidy spoke with SGR Editor Greenberg on November 21. Following is the text, transcribed and edited by SGR.

•

SGR. *What are some of your recent accomplishments for university clients?*

Cassidy. We've been successful in obtaining funding for a Materials Research Center at Massachusetts University, in Amherst. It's for $10 million, funded by the General Services Administration [GSA: landlord, housekeeper, and storage manager for federal agencies]. It's under the Strategic Materials Stockpile program. And the rationale for it was that the intensive study of polymers at the Research Center would return to the government a reduction in the need for strategic materials far beyond the amount invested.

SGR. *Is there any precedent for GSA putting money into a research building?*

Cassidy. No. But I think it's an outstanding thing for it to do.

SGR. *It sounds like a new high in creativity.*

Cassidy. I think it was very creative. And in this day and age, with the difficulties that science has in obtaining funds, I think it's rather a large net plus for science to have funding coming from that kind of a source in government. The University should have the money early next year.

SGR. *How long did you work on that one?*

Cassidy. Two years.

SGR. *What's your route to GSA? It's an agency that's never been mentioned in all the Congressional and academic discussions of federal funds for laboratory buildings.*

Cassidy. We wanted to discover a place to do polymer research funding, and we started to think through the various authorities and what polymers were doing. Polymers are replacing strategic materials. And it seemed logical to us that rather than spend that money to store strategic materials, the government—without spending any more money—could reduce the need for strategic materials while at the same time expanding the scientific base of the country. And it was a much more creative thing to do with the money. So, we sold that idea on the Hill.

SGR. *Were Congressional hearings held on this?*

Cassidy. It was discussed in hearings. It was discussed in a number of meetings. We had representatives of the university and industries involved in this field—General

(Continued on page 3)

In Brief

AAAS brass are quietly puzzling over the outcome of voting for President-elect of the organization. The shoo-in candidate was expected to be Lewis M. Branscomb, Chief Scientist of IBM, former head of both the National Bureau of Standards and the National Science Board, and highly regarded as a workhorse in national science-policy affairs. The winner: Sheila Widnall, a AAAS Board member and Professor of Aeronautics and Astronautics at MIT. The official count is yet to come, but the vote, by mail ballot, was approximately 13,000 to 12,000. Eligible to vote: 136,000 AAAS members. One AAAS staff member told SGR, "No reflection on Widnall, but it doesn't make sense."

Phase 2 is coming up in the marathon proceedings of the Science Policy Task Force of the House Science and Technology Committee. After probing 12 major subject areas in hearings that started last April, the aim is to produce a draft report next May. Then come hearings to obtain comments from academe, government, and industry. Meanwhile, the Task Force will conduct a series of one-witness "mini-hearings," starting at 8:30 am and running for about an hour.

Latest survey from the Scientific Manpower Commission finds salaries for 1985 bachelor chemistry grads up by 8 percent, to $22,764, but the number of offers down by 12 percent. Computer sciences and petroleum engineering were tops, at around $30,000; in the pits, the biological sciences, at $17,200. (From "Salaries of Scientists, Engineers and Technicians," 196 pages, $35 prepaid, Scientific Manpower Commission, 1500 Massachusetts Ave. Nw., Suite 831, Washington, DC 20005.)

Congressional Staff Veterans Fill Firm's Ranks

With its university clientele up from 12 to 20 institutions in 2 years, the lobbying firm of Cassidy and Associates prospers on the complexities and dissatisfactions of federal-academic relations. Though university lobbying accounts for only one-third of the firm's business, according to President Gerald S. J. Cassidy, he says it's the fastest-growing sector.

Supporters of the status quo insist that the current system for distributing federal money for R&D and related activities is equitable but underfinanced. Cassidy's customers are united in their unwillingness to share the poverty. They include Columbia, Tufts, Northwestern, Indiana University, Atlanta University, Boston University, the University of Massachussets, and Catholic University. In establishment circles, the firm and its clients are angrily regarded as predators against a troubled though valuable system.

Cassidy wouldn't discuss fees during the November 21 interview with SGR, but 2 years ago, when he was in partnership as Schlossberg and Cassidy, he offered the "ballpark" figures of $25,000 to $120,000 a year as the range for annual retainers for academic clients (SGR Vol. XIII, No. 19). Last year, he bought out his partner, Kenneth Schlossberg, with whom he had teamed up for lobbying in 1975; Schlossberg now runs his own firm. As one federal R&D official put it to SGR in 1983, the partners had a reputation for "making buildings appear."

The Cassidy firm is not alone in the academic lobbying business in Washington. Many universities maintain their own outposts in the capital or hire freelance agents. On a wholesale basis, the big academic trade organizations, like the 50-member Association of American Universities, lobby for their crowd while denouncing lobbying as unseemly.

As a profit-making organization, however, Cassidy and Associates is by far the largest of Washington's university lobbyists, and it projects an appropriate appearance of prosperity in 12,000 square feet of prime office space in a new building in downtown Washington. It is strong in the mainstays of Washington lobbying: Congressional staff alumni with contacts ranging from Capitol Hill to the "downtown agencies." In addition, the firm's roster of fulltime staff members includes 2 former university presidents with extensive experience on the Washington scene: Frank Rose, University of Alabama, and Elvis J. Stahr Jr., Indiana University.

As is the case throughout the Washington lobbying industry, the fruitfulness of contacts can vary widely, from actual delivery of the goods to merely polite gestures to help a lobbyist friend impress a client. But many out-of-town academics are baffled by the Washington maze, and tend to regard these for-hire pathfinders as wondermen, even for getting them in to see a deputy to the deputy assistant secretary who can perform neither harm nor good.

President Gerald S. J. Cassidy, an attorney, comes from a contact-filled political background: A total of 5 years as General Counsel of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition, with time out in 1973 to serve as Executive Director of the Democratic National Committee Reform Commission.

Members of the Cassidy firm include:

James P. Fabiani, formerly on the staff of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, as assistant to the ranking Republican member, Silvio O. Conte of Massachusetts.

Carl Franklin Godfrey Jr., former Executive Assistant to House Speaker "Tip" O'Neill (D-Mass).

Jonathan M. Orloff, former Legislative Assistant to Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.).

George A. Ramonas, former Legislative Assistant to Senator Pete V. Domenici (R-New Mexico), Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee.

James M. Johnson, former Deputy Under Secretary of Agriculture and member of the staff of Rep. Trent Lott of Mississippi, House Republican Whip.

Willard F. Cox, former Special Assistant to Rep. Don Fuqua (R-Fla.), Chairman, House Science and Technology Committee.

Vincent M. Versage, formerly on the staffs of Rep. Timothy Wirth (D-Colo.) and Senator Spark Matsunaga (D-Hawaii).

James P. Collins (who heads the Cassidy Boston office), formerly a member of the Massachussets legislature and Deputy Legislative Secretary to the Governor.

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1985

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, $185.00 (two years, $325.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

. . . We've Added to the Total Support of Science

(Continued from page 1)

Electric, Monsanto, all joined. Incidentally, we were also successful in working with the University so that the State is appropriating $10 million and private industry is investing in it. So, it's going to be perhaps a $25-million Center.

***SGR.** Was the U. Mass. Center included in the President's budget last year?*

Cassidy. No. It was introduced by Congressman Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.), who represents the district. It was a normal hearing process. It went through the Appropriations Subcommittees.

[The U. Mass. funds were included in a $13.1-billion Post Office, Treasury, and General Government appropriations bill that exceeded the President's request by $951 million. A veto, on November 15, is not likely to be overridden, but the U. Mass. item is expected to survive as part of a separate bill that continues funding for the agencies involved].

Atlanta University Project

***SGR.** What else have you been doing?*

Cassidy. One of the most important projects we've done this year is a Science and Engineering Center at Atlanta University, which we think will provide them with resources that they couldn't have obtained anywhere else. It will allow them to raise the necessary private funds to substantially improve the capabilities of the university to compete for research dollars.

***SGR.** Who's funding that?*

Cassidy. The Department of Energy. It was a project that we worked through the Administration, with the Department of Energy.

***SGR.** Did this go through the normal review process, or was it another end run?*

Cassidy. It was recommended by the Department of Energy. They had a press conference announcing their support for it. The first $6 million will go out this year, and we expect it to be a $20-million project.

There are a number of other projects that came through here. The Center for Excellence in Education at Indiana University is one of them. That's for $6 million. That was authorized by the Congress last year; there were extensive hearings. This year, the funds were appropriated, and the funds come through the Department of Education. It is a program aimed at improving instructional methodology.

***SGR.** Was the Indiana Center originally in the budget of the Department of Education?*

Cassidy. No, it was not.

***SGR.** Then it was introduced on the Hill, as a Congressional initiative?*

Cassidy. That's right. I think the interesting thing about all of our projects is that they have added to the amount of money being spent in education or in science. And, in these days, that's what makes them such a plus. Oftentimes, our critics will refer to the fact that this wasn't in the President's budget, which is an odd point of view for the advocates of science to take, and it's a most naive point of view about the way the government works. Because the President simply proposes; the Congress disposes.

We believe that the appropriate place for these decisions to be made is in the Congress, because they are political decisions. They are decisions about what the economy is going to be like in the future in a particular place. What's going to come out for the economy from polymer research, or what's going to come out of the Southwest, in terms of technological development—all of those things have to do with where the government puts its education and scientific dollars. And we believe that, most appropriately, that is a decision to be made by the Congress.

Some people think otherwise. They believe in a mythic kind of process that allows for a group of wise men to get together, unfettered by personal interest, and make perfect decisions. That doesn't, in fact, happen.

Cartel Gets the Lion's Share

***SGR.** Are you advocating policymaking by the smartest lobbyists?*

Cassidy. Not at all. There's a cartel of people who were blessed by receiving the federal bounty before anyone else knew there was a federal bounty. In the days of a non-competitive era, they were able to obtain the federal research centers that made them great research institutions, and then were able to turn public opinion in favor of a system that rewarded people who had these facilities. Because they had the scientists to do the work, they could benefit from a review system based on those priorities.

***SGR.** Is it conceivable that those funds going to U. Mass. or Indiana might be better spent, let's say, in Oregon or Florida?*

Cassidy. In both those cases, no. Both of those institutions had the imagination, the drive, and the commitment to the programs to go out and get state funding, private participation, foundation dollars. And by their efforts, they have distinguished themselves. These facilities will enhance their human resources, because through the long history of federal funding for facilities,

(Continued on page 4)

. . . 20 Universities Receive 40 Percent of Money

(Continued from page 3)

it is the facilities that attract the people and it is the people who then attract the research dollars in our competitive system. So, if you have the facilities, you can compete.

SGR. *What about the many schools that insist that the dominant system is fair and that these tactics shouldn't be allowed to interfere with it?*

Cassidy. I think those people are very realistic. There are 592 [academic] research institutions in this country, and 20 of them get 40 percent of the research dollars.

SGR. *You represent at least one of those 20.*

Cassidy. At least one of them. Seven of those institutions have federal laboratories that bring them another $2 billion without any peer review.

"Un-Peer-Reviewed" Money

SGR. *Like the Hopkins Applied Physics Lab and the MIT Lincoln Lab?*

Cassidy. Sure. There's no peer review of that system. Several of them are also land-grant institutions, which receive some $940 million in un-peer-reviewed money from the Department of Agriculture. Yet, they are able to take these un-peer-reviewed dollars and these un-peer-reviewed research facilities, concentrate them, and build a mass of activity that allows them to compete in a way that so advantages them, compared to other institutions, that they walk off with 40 percent of the research dollars.

When the other 572 institutions can only get 60 percent of the dollars, there's something inherently wrong with that system. And there's something wrong with the fact that those institutions are mostly crammed tightly into 3 narrow geographic areas—New England, the industrial Midwest, and California.

You can see the continuing effects of that cartel in NSF's award this year of 4 supercomputers. All 4 went to members of that top-20 fraternity [University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), UC San Diego, Cornell, and Princeton]—all in areas of previous research concentration, leaving the entire South, Southwest, Rocky Mountain region, Pacific Northwest out of the whole system.

NSF then awards engineering centers [at UC Santa Barbara, Columbia, University of Delaware (in collaboration with Rutgers), University of Maryland (with Harvard), MIT, and Purdue]. Again, the same regions, and in each of the instances, it's related to those 20 institutions, either as the direct recipient or in a collaborative effort with one of the top 20. If you're from State U., and you're looking for support for a novel idea, they'll often tell you, "Get Professor X at distinguished University Y to join you on this effort, and we'll be able to fund it." Outside of the British peerage, it has to be the oldest old-boy network in the world.

SGR. *Your client Columbia was being well taken care of by this system—it's well in the top 20; yet, you directed a lobbying effort that got it about $25 million it wouldn't otherwise have gotten for a chemistry building (SGR Vol. XIII, No. 10, "Tales from the Pork-Barrel Route to R&D Money").*

Cassidy. The justification for Columbia is very simple. At the time that NSF was making major facilities grants to institutions, in the 1960s, Columbia was not in a position to apply for them, and Columbia missed its funding cycle. All that was being repaired here was that. They were just playing catchup. They are clearly a distinguished institution, and it certainly is in the national interest to make sure that the most distinguished organic chemistry program in the country has the appropriate facilities to conduct research. It will only work for the national benefit.

SGR. *Are you helping your clients get a piece of the Strategic Defense Initiative?*

Cassidy. Yes. One of the first consortiums funded in this area included a client of ours—New York Polytechnic Institute, in Brooklyn [which has been awarded $400,000 by SDI].

SGR. *Did you represent the consortium or just New York Polytechnic?*

Cassidy. Just New York Poly, guiding them through the process. We're working on others, but they're not at a point where I can talk about them.

Looking for Star Wars

SGR. *Does SDI look like a promising area?*

Cassidy. The question with SDI is whether it achieves equilibrium quickly in terms of how much money really is going to be in it. That's a real question. It's going to be around for a long time, and it's going to have a lot of money to spend. The political controversy will shape it to some degree, because of the possibility that universities will push themselves out of SDI.

SGR. *Push themselves out?*

Cassidy. That they will lead the leadership of SDI to conclude that they're unwelcome at universities and that this will lead to private research companies conducting the research. And I believe that the universities may come to regret that, because in the future, universities are going to see competition from the private sector in the area of basic research. It would not surprise me to

(Continued on page 5)

Six R&D Agencies in Anti-Red Tape Experiment

After 2 years of staff preparations and trials on a scale suitable for a major military operation, 6 federal research agencies are said to be nearly ready for an experiment in unified, simplified granting procedures for some, but not all, of their support at the University of Miami and the Florida State University System.

Known as the Florida Demonstration Project, the trial seeks to harmonize the administrative peculiarities of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Energy, the Office of Naval Research, and the Department of Agriculture. January is the hoped-for but not altogether certain starting date. Presented here verbatim, a segment of a November 6 staff memo from NSF Director Erich Bloch explains it all:

The purpose of the demonstration is to test a standard and simplified Federal research grant which helps alleviate the fragmentation of researchers' programs of research caused by multiple points of federal support. The demonstration will test the hypothesis that standardizing most federal requirements and bringing the financial and administrative requirements for the conduct of research into harmony with the needs of conducting research will increase research productivity and produce cost savings for federal agencies and academic institutions, as well as help identify the impact of state and local requirements.

Among the items in the trial are local, rather than Washington agency, authority over foreign travel and major equipment purchases, if—in Bloch's words—"pertinent grantee systems are adequate." But, Bloch added, NSF will retain approval authority over "changes in scope" of research projects and in change of principal investigators.

If this Florida trial is deemed successful, the procedures may be extended to other university projects supported by the 6 agencies.

Additional information is available from Robert Newton, head of the Policy Office, NSF, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC, 20550; tel. 202/357-7880.

Library of Congress Names Science Policy Director

Richard E. Rowberg, Manager of the Energy and Materials Program at the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), has been appointed Director of the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, part of the Library of Congress. A physicist and 10-year veteran of OTA, Rowberg succeeds James M. McCullough, who stepped down last year.

The Division turns out a large load of reports and analyses, mainly in response to requests from Congressional committees with R&D jurisdictions. It is little-known off Capitol Hill, but along with OTA and the General Accounting Office, the Science Policy Research Division does a lot of the background work for on-stage legislative activities involving R&D.

Lobby

(Continued from page 4)

see it develop out of SDI. I certainly believe that given the resources, private industry could be competitive in that area.

SGR. *What's services do you provide for an academic client?*

Cassidy. What we can do is an analysis of future funding opportunities. Take biotechnology, for example. We can give a long-term political view that is unrivaled. We can put together a strategy for achieving funding in that area. We can study the resources of the institution and tell them how they should be structured in order to pursue that funding. We conduct for all our clients a resource inventory to learn about the institution and how to apply its resources to this task. We can help them to plan development in this area. We have people who plan whole medical campuses, whole academic campuses. We work with them to develop the plan for what is essentially a real estate development. We work with them to bring about a coalition in behalf of this development in the community, with the city or town, with industry in that area. We work with them to put together a marketing concept, to the private sector, the public, state and local government.

We have an extensive computer capability. One of the things we provide clients is our research capability. We have conference rooms. We have our clients in. We're conducting seminars for our clients, and next year we're going to increase this effort. We're going to be bringing in speakers from the different areas of concern. We're going to be having very specialized seminars for small groups of people with particular interest in finance, taxation, or research funding.

SGR. *Have you ever struck out on a big deal for a university?*

Cassidy. So far, no. We're very, very selective. For every client we contract with, we probably send away at least one. We have to really believe that the project is fundable.

Overhead Rates: Freeze Effort Dies in Congress

In Washington's hierarchy of the administratively occult, the computation of overhead, or indirect, costs on federal research grants remains firmly enthroned as king. It also remains beyond political reach, as was demonstrated last month when Senate conferees yielded to the House and dropped a provision that would have frozen NIH overhead payments at the 1985 level—which averaged out to about 45 cents for each dollar awarded directly for research.

Responding to lobbyists' pleas that academe needs the money, regardless of the flaky arithmetic that draws it from the NIH budget, the conferees merely urged restraint in both direct and indirect costs. Less for each, they said, would loosen up money to maintain a "floor" of 6100 new and competing grants annually; that's 100 above the current planned level, and 1100 more than the Office of Management and Budget sought last year when it unsuccessfully tried to crimp NIH spending.

Meanwhile, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy has responded to a Congressional request for guidance on the overhead issue with a suggestion for paying only a standardized flat percentage for administrative costs—the fastest growing component in the overhead package. The suggestion derives from the recogniztion that many university money managers have become increasingly sharp at saddling NIH with charges that have little or nothing to do with relevant costs of carrying out NIH-supported research projects.

Since the immense variations in university overhead rates are rarely seen in public, SGR is presenting the current list of rates for major institutions, as prepared by the 2 government agencies responsible for setting academic rates—the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Naval Research.

Our governmental guide in these opaque matters explains that differences between similar institutions can arise from such matters as "different levels of administration—6 vice presidents compared to 1, let's say." Overhead rates can also be affected by differing accounting practices. "Some universities charge phones and supplies to direct costs, some charge them to indirect," it was explained.

In any case, the list shows HHS' most recently computed rates, along with any differences in 1985 rates. Some of the listed rates are rigidly fixed, while others are considered provisional and subject to adjustment (usually minor) following an audit.

	1986	1985
Albany Med. Coll	70.0	
Arizona State U	42.0	
Baylor Coll. of Med.	42.5	
Boston U	81.8	73.8
Bowman Gray Schl. Med	40.5	38.7
Brandeis U	57.0	
Case Western Reserve	48.5	
Colorado State U	39.9	38.8
Dartmouth College	51.0	53.0
Duke U	50.0	
Emory U	NA	51.5
Florida State U	44.2	
George Washington U	56.0	
Georgetown U	59.0	55.3
Harvard Med. School	99.0	
Harvard U	62.4	
Howard U	90.0	
Indiana U	46.0	45.0
Iowa State	34.0	
Johns Hopkins	61.0	64.0
Lehigh U	65.0	72.0
La. State U Med. Ctr	38.0	
Louisiana State U	43.0	
Medical Coll. of Wisc	58.1	62.0
Med. U. of S. Carolina	49.0	58.0
Michigan State U	41.0	
Mt. Sinai Med. School	65.0	
NYU	50.0	
NYU. Medical Center	71.5	
NC State, Raleigh	42.0	41.0
Northwestern U	44.0	
Ohio State U	45.0	
Oklahoma State U	53.4	37.5
Oregon State U	34.0	
Purdue U	46.0	45.5
RPI	68.0	
Rice U	39.0	
Rockefeller U	60.0	
Rutgers U	66.0	65.0
St. Louis U	40.0	
SUNY, Albany	49.4	
SUNY, Buffalo	49.6	
SUNY, Stony Brook	49.5	
SUNY, Downstate Med	53.2	
Temple U	62.0	
Texas A&M	38.0	35.0
Texas Tech U	39.0	36.0
Thomas Jefferson U	65.0	
Tufts U	84.0	
Tulane U. Med. School	48.0	
U of Ala., Birmingham	NA	40.0
U of Arizona	44.0	42.0
UC Berkeley	45.6	44.0
UC Davis	39.0	
UC Irvine	43.0	41.0
UCLA	46.0	43.0
UC Riverside	40.5	
U San Diego	43.0	36.5
UC San Francisco	32.6	30.6
UC Santa Barbara	45.0	43.0
U Chicago	69.0	

(Continued on page 7)

In Print: Engineering, R&D Centers, OTA Reports

From the National Academy Press, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-3313:

Continuing Education of Engineers, report by an NAS panel chaired by Morris S. Steinberg, VP for Science, Lockheed, plays the how-little-we-know theme on the extent and value of continuing education of engineers ("Despite the enormous resources devoted to continuing education, little is known about its effects")—and comes out with a recommendation that NSF study the subject. (92 pages, $12.50)

Youth Employment and Training Programs, report of a study aimed at assessing the effects of the $2-billion-a-year 1977 Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act, which flourished during the Carter Administration and was promptly terminated when Reagan took office. Produced by a panel chaired by Robinson G. Hollister Jr., Swarthmore College economist, the report says the job training and other assistance, which involved a total of 6 million youths, apparently produced many positive results. But it cautions that the programs were too shortlived, hurriedly planned, and poorly documented to support firm conclusions about their effectiveness. (495 pages, $24.95)

•

From the Gale Research Co., Book Tower, Detroit, Michigan 48226; tel. 313/961-2242:

Research Centers Directory, 10th edition, entries for 8300 US and Canadian research organizations in the physical, biomedical, social sciences, and policy studies, plus agencies for administering and coordinating research; listings include director's name, general areas of research, size of staff, and publications. (1561 pages, 2 volumes, $340 per set)

Scientific and Technical Organizations and Agencies Directory, 1st edition, lists some 12,000 organizations, including federal and state agencies, professional associations, libraries, and consulting firms. (1363 pages, 2 volumes, $140 per set)

•

From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, 600 Pennsylvania Ave. Se., Washington, DC 20510; tel. 202/224-8996:

Assessment Activities, summaries of OTA projects in progress and recently completed. (65 pages, no charge)

List of Publications, a bibliography of hundreds of OTA reports, background papers, memoranda, and proceedings issued over the past decade, along with instructions on ordering copies. (53 pages, no charge)

Overhead Rates *(Continued from page 6)*

	1986	1985
U Cincinnati	49.0	50.0
U Colorado	41.5	
U Colorado HSC	36.0	
U Connecticut	49.06	
U Connecticut HSC	55.0	
U Delaware	65.0	63.0
U Florida	42.0	47.0
U Georgia	NA	42.4
U Houston	42.0	
U Iowa	40.0	
U of Kansas	45.0	
U Kansas Med. Center	40.0	
U Kentucky	50.0	
U Md., Baltimore	41.0	
U Md., College Park	39.0	
U Mass., Amherst	48.0	
U Mass Medical School	80.0	
U Medicine, Dent. NJ	73.0	
U Miami Medical School	NA	54.93
U Michigan	50.0	
U Minnesota	41.0	
U Mississippi	NA	38.10
U Missouri, Columbia	37.50	
U New Hampshire	54.50	55.0
U New Mexico Medical	46.0	
U NC, Chapel Hill	43.5	41.6
U North Dakota	35.0	
U Oklahoma	43.0	
U Oregon	41.0	
U Oregon, HSC	42.5	43.0
U Pennsylvania	65.0	64.0
U Pittsburgh	43.0	46.0
U South Carolina	NA	44.0
U Southern California	61.0	
U Tenn., Knoxville	42.0	45.0
U Tenn. HSC	NA	40.0
U Texas, Austin	42.0	
U Texas Cancer Center	41.0	
U Texas HSC, Dallas	42.0	
U Texas HSC, Houston	45.0	
U Texas HSC, San Ant.	40.5	
U Texas Med. Galveston	40.0	
U Utah	45.50	
U Vermont & State Ag.	50.3	58.7
U Virginia	52.0	50.0
U Washington	43.0	40.0
U Wisconsin, Madison	43.0	
U Wyoming	39.0	38
Utah State U	35.0	32.0
Vanderbilt U	NA	54.4
Va. Commonwealth U	50.0	
Va. Poly and State U	50.0	45.0
Washington State	43.5	
Washington U	51.0	
Wayne State U	45.0	
Yale U	68.0	
Yeshiva U	87.5	

Next Issue: Universities Rated By Office of Naval Research

Keyworth Draws Fire for Star Wars Cheerleading

Science-policy mandarins have been griping to the press about the President's Science Adviser, George A. Keyworth II. They complain that he's a cheerleader for the Strategic Defense Initiative rather than the dispassionate collector of scientific wisdom for his chief that they say they would like him to be.

"Many scientific leaders . . . have expressed dismay that Keyworth has not only adopted the President's position but has become a vigorous public advocate of the SDI," the *Washington Post* reported November 12. It added that "Critics, including predecessors who asked not to be identified, insist that Keyworth goes too far in trying to change the minds of dissenting scientists."

How does Keyworth, the most truculent ever of all Presidential science advisers, plead to the charges? Proudly guilty, as he has indicated in numerous discussions of his role, in SGR and elsewhere. Unaffected by the delusions that have become attached to his glamorous-sounding but relatively low-ranking position in the governmental hierarchy, Keyworth describes himself as "a guest in the President's house." He's there to support the President's policies, rather than to serve as an independent wizard, he insists. And he argues that in that respect, he's no different from previous Presidential Science Advisers—just more open about it and on the other side of the political spectrum.

Keyworth is different, both in scientific origin and White House performance. After several scientific luminaries turned down the job, he was appointed on the recommendation of Edward Teller from the obscurity of a physics research post at Los Alamos. Unlike his predecessors, he didn't come from an academic career, and, unlike them, he came into office openly skeptical of science's priorities for spending federal money. To the astonishment of many, he was most critical of the government laboratory system from which he sprang, and he led a bruising fight to cut that budget and redeploy the money to university laboratories.

The irony of Keyworth's tenure is that his critics are mainly homebased in or drawn from universities that have richly benefited from his redesign of federal science budgets. He's their loudly proclaimed villain in arms-control matters and as gatekeeper against dissenting scientific advice in the White House. But, in harmony with a science-boosting Congress, Keyworth rates the credit for boosting federal cash for basic science, mostly in universities, from $4.7 billion in 1980 to nearly $8 billion this year—rare growth outside the Pentagon in recent years.

There is, of course, a link between the Science Adviser's slavish promotion of Star Wars and the good regard he's acquired in the White House inner circle. But the elders of the scientific community view the occupant of the White House advisory post as science's ambassador to Washington. And, with many of them in the anti-Star Wars camp, they're distressed that their emissary isn't with them all the way.

Keyworth cheerfully compounds the situation with public denunciations of Star Wars opponents as "politically motivated demagogues." He says, and apparently believes, that "much of the press seems to be drawn from a relatively narrow fringe element on the far left of our society"—a familiar Reaganite theme.

His critics allege that he's demeaning what they regard as the illustrious post of Presidential Science Adviser by failing to provide the White House councils with dissenting views on Star Wars and other techno-political issues. Many of them, to their dismay, have not be consulted on anything.

Their complaints are irrelevant. The Reagan White House is not receptive to dissenting views on its heartfelt issues. The President's Science Adviser is not a sovereign power. He is, as Keyworth puts it, "a guest in the President's house." —DSG

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106